

GCE

Psychology

Unit **G543**: Options in Applied Psychology

Advanced GCE

Mark Scheme for June 2016

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.















This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the report on the examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2016

Annotation	Meaning of annotation
	Unclear
	Attempts evaluation
	Benefit of doubt
	Context
	Cross
	Evaluation
	Confirm at SSU
	
	Significant amount of material which doesn't answer the question
	Not answered question
	Good use of resources
	Tick
	Development of point
	Omission mark

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
1 (a)	<p>How can criminal thinking patterns explain criminal behaviour?</p> <p>Refer to Appendix 1</p> <p>The concept of criminal thinking patterns is that offenders have different cognitions than non-offenders, and these “thinking errors” lead them to engage in criminal behaviours. A good answer will identify some criminal thinking patterns and then explain how such thinking errors could lead to criminal behaviour. Evidence to support the answer is likely to come from Yochelson & Samenow (1976, 1984) or Palmer & Hollin (2004). Any other relevant research is acceptable (e.g. with explicit links to low levels of moral development or patterns of attributional bias). Weaker answers may just describe research without engaging with the command of the question.</p>	10	<p>Top band candidates will clearly describe the link between criminal thinking patterns and criminal behaviour, showing extension in detail and/or understanding.</p> <p>Second band will be accurate and specific to title but may demonstrate only limited detail or extension. Third band will be superficial, using accurate or appropriate material but not to effectively address the question.</p> <p>The bottom band is for responses that may be flawed but have some creditworthy material included.</p>
(b)	<p>Assess the strengths and limitations of research into cognitive explanations of criminal behaviour.</p> <p>Refer to Appendix 2</p> <p>Candidates can use a wide range of issues to answer the question, as long as they relate specifically to research into cognition and criminal behaviour. Suitable issues may include: issues related to ecological validity, validity, reliability, ethics, generalisation from the sample, qualitative/quantitative data etc</p> <p>As the question asks for strengths and limitations, at least one of each is required. Relevant research includes: Palmer & Hollin (2000, 2004), Yochelson & Samenow (1976, 1984), Kohlberg (1963), Chen & Howitt (2007), Gudjonsson & Bownes (2002), Gudjonsson & Sigurdsson (2007); other relevant research is also creditworthy.</p>	15	<p>At the top band candidates will provide a well-developed and/or elaborated response containing precise evaluative points and/or issues which assess strengths or limitations of the research. Evidence to support points or issues will be apposite.</p> <p>Band 2 will cover a range of relevant issues supported by evidence but will lack balance or development.</p> <p>Band 3 will have some issues which assess the strengths and limitations of research but is quite limited.</p> <p>Bottom band is very basic with little development or supporting evidence.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
2 (a)	<p>Describe how one factor may influence accurate identification when interviewing witnesses.</p> <p>Refer to Appendix 1</p> <p>It is likely that weapon focus as described by Elizabeth Loftus (1987) will be the factor described in most answers. This is the tendency of witnesses to direct their attention towards a weapon which reduces their accuracy in identifying the suspect or other information from the scene. Responses suggesting other factors could be appropriate here if they engage with the question (e.g. Bruce's work for example on internal/external features could be explored, or use of leading questions, use of cognitive interviewing, use of e-fit, or research into witness-identifying conditions, etc.). Good answers will explain the influence clearly, supporting their answer with evidence. Weaker answers will merely describe research without engaging with the question.</p>	10	<p>Top band candidates will clearly explain how a factor such as weapon focus might affect a witness's ability to identify details from witnessing a crime, for example the appearance of a suspect, details of the crime etc. showing extension in detail and/or understanding. For example supporting points with evidence from research</p> <p>Weaker responses may just give anecdotal responses with little empirical support.</p>
(b)	<p>To what extent can research into interviewing witnesses be considered scientific?</p> <p>Refer to Appendix 2</p> <p>The scientific approach to psychology involves the use of experiments, accurate, objective measurements and controls to eliminate possible confounding variables. A good answer would relate these features of the scientific approach (or other relevant features) to research on interviewing witnesses and make a judgement as to what extent they are scientific. Relevant research includes Loftus (1987), Bruce (1988, 2002), Fisher & Geiselman (1985, 1989), Frowd (2012).</p>	15	<p>At the top band candidates will provide a well-developed and/or elaborated response containing precise evaluative points and/or issues which impact on the extent to which research can be seen as scientific. Evidence to support points or issues will be well chosen and effective.</p> <p>Band 2 will cover a range of relevant points supported by evidence but will lack balance or development.</p> <p>Band 3 will have some issues which address the question but is quite limited.</p> <p>Bottom band is very basic – 'it is scientific because.....' or an 'it isn't very scientific...' type response with little development or supporting evidence.</p>

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
3	(a)	<p>What effect do shields and videotape have on children giving evidence?</p> <p>Refer to Appendix 1</p> <p>The question could be interpreted in various ways, either focussing on the effects upon the children themselves, or the impact of shields or video links upon the outcome of a case. Ross et al (1994) supported the use of video or shields because it found they had no significant effect on the jury, enabling children giving evidence to feel less intimidated.</p>	10	<p>Top band candidates will clearly describe the effect shields and videotape have upon children/juries, showing extension in detail and/or understanding.</p> <p>Second band will be accurate and specific to title but may demonstrate only limited detail or extension.</p> <p>Third band will be superficial, using accurate or appropriate material but not to effectively address the question.</p> <p>The bottom band is for responses that may be flawed but have some creditworthy material included.</p>
	(b)	<p>Evaluate the ethics of research into witness appeal.</p> <p>Refer to Appendix 2</p> <p>Candidates can identify points within research where ethical guidelines have been adhered to, or conversely where guidelines may have been breached. This topic area should yield a variety of issues. For example the subject matter in some of the child witness studies has clear potential to cause distress. Relevant research includes Castellow (1990), Penrod & Cutler (1995), Ross et al (1994).</p>	15	<p>At the top band candidates will provide a well-developed and/or elaborated response containing precise evaluative points and/or issues which impact on the ethics of the research. A balanced argument would contain both positive and negative points which show a deeper understanding of ethics. Points should be supported by appropriate evidence.</p> <p>Band 2 will cover a range of relevant issues supported by evidence but will lack balance or development.</p> <p>Band 3 will have some issues which address the validity of research but is quite limited.</p> <p>Bottom band is very basic – ‘it is ethical because.....’ or an ‘it isn’t very ethical...’ type response with little development or supporting evidence.</p>

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
4	(a)	<p>Describe one piece of research into anger management as an offender treatment programme.</p> <p>Refer to Appendix 1</p> <p>Research by Jane Ireland on the use of anger management with young male offenders is likely to be described here, although other appropriate research is creditworthy. Better answers will clearly explain the research, weaker answers will be poorly structured and list like.</p>	10	<p>Top band candidates will clearly describe research into the use of anger management as an offender treatment programme.</p> <p>Second band will be accurate and specific to title but may demonstrate only limited detail or extension; third band will be superficial, using accurate or appropriate material but not to effectively address the question. For example merely describing anger management without details of research.</p> <p>The bottom band is for responses that may be flawed but have some creditworthy material included.</p>
	(b)	<p>Discuss methodological problems researchers may have when investigating offender treatment programmes.</p> <p>Refer to Appendix 2</p> <p>There are a wide range of methodological problems which researchers in this area may encounter. Validity is a key issue as measuring the effectiveness of treatment programmes can be plagued with issues of social desirability, especially where offenders report their own anger levels. The use of official statistics on reoffending levels has a host of problems also. Matching treatment and control groups, or finding representative samples are other rich areas of evaluation. Relevant research includes Friendship et al (2002), Cann (2006), Sadlier (2010), Ireland (2004), Wheatley (2005).</p>	15	<p>Top band candidates will provide a well-developed and/or elaborated response containing more precise evaluative points and/or issues and should include a range of problems encountered by researchers in this area.</p> <p>Band 2 will cover a range of relevant issues supported by evidence, but will lack balance or development.</p> <p>Band 3 will identify some problems which affect research but is quite limited.</p> <p>A highly superficial response would constitute an answer in the bottom (1-3) band.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
5 (a)	<p>How can non-adherence to a medical regime be measured physiologically?</p> <p>Refer to Appendix 1</p> <p>Candidates may refer to one or more physiological measures of non-adherence to a medical regime (e.g. blood test, urine analysis, blood pressure, GHb, the bromide method, heart rate, spirometer, etc.). The specification identifies Lustman, 2000. Any other approach or research is also a legitimate response to this question (e.g. Braam, 2008). The better candidate will refer to how non-adherence to medical advice can be measured or has been measured in research, in other words they will refer to the application rather than merely reporting a study, for example. Thus, quality of description and interpretation of evidence will typify the better response.</p>	10	<p>Detail, quality of description and interpretation of evidence will typify the better response. A direct response to the question, using psychological knowledge to address the question, addressing specifically the 'how' of a measure of non-adherence will be indicative of the best candidates. An implied response or compromising detail may indicate a second band response, whereas a more superficial reporting of a study would be credited in the third band. Failing to achieve this but with some creditworthy material will achieve a bottom band mark.</p>
(b)	<p>Discuss methodological difficulties of investigating adherence to medical regimes.</p> <p>Refer to Appendix 2</p> <p>Research in this area may sensitive and as such is subject to additional difficulties beyond those which may be encountered in the normal run of conducting a piece of research. Asking patients to count and report on adherence has a range of possible distortions, from lack of accuracy to not wishing to admit they have forgotten or deliberately avoided taking medication. Whether this is rational could be said to involve subjective and value-laden judgement. Retrospective data may be flawed in many ways from inaccuracy to distorted interpretation, self-report by subjective comment, demand characteristics, social desirability and the like. Any method may address</p>	15	<p>At the top level a developed and/or elaborated response containing precise discussion points and/or issues. Appreciation that any method of collecting data has strengths and weaknesses. Specific references, such as to research examples will typify a response in top band. An accurate but less developed response will constitute a second band response; a somewhat limited, superficial, more generic response that is nonetheless correct would find itself in the third band; and an answer that, while being flawed, contains some creditworthy material will receive a bottom band mark.</p>

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
		problems of other methods but all too easily raises issues of its own. Ethical concerns could be relevant but need linking to methodology. The methodological questions of size of sample, representativeness of sample, being able to generalise the sample, ethnocentrism and so on may also apply. Note that the question asks for discussion about methodological difficulties, and some candidates may fall into the trap of listing difficulties rather than engaging in discussion.		
6	(a)	<p>Describe research that uses a combined approach to measuring stress.</p> <p>Refer to Appendix 1</p> <p>Candidates are aware that self-report measures are common, such as Holmes and Rahe's Social Readjustment Rating Scale, as are physiological measures such as cortisol levels in urine samples or GSR measures. Any studies where these approaches can be found in combination are acceptable responses, most likely being Johansson (1978) who compared stress levels in those whose jobs involved responsibility to others with lower levels of responsibility.</p>	10	The best candidates will show enough knowledge of detail or level of understanding to relate the research to specifically addressing the question. In this instance, emphasis on the types of measures as part of the research constitutes a top band answer. An answer in the second band will either do this but with less detail or will do this but less explicitly. Third band will demonstrate knowledge of the relevant research but this may be superficial and/or not used to effectively to address the question; and flawed but with some creditworthy material will constitute a bottom band mark.
	(b)	<p>Assess the reliability of different methods of measuring stress.</p> <p>Refer to Appendix 2</p> <p>Reliability basically asks "would you get the same, consistent results if the study was replicated?" It asks whether consistent findings would be produced across situations and time. This can be extended to consider different types of reliability. Internal reliability concerns the</p>	15	At the top level a developed and/or elaborated response, maybe following a line of argument. 'Assess' implies some level of judgement beyond absolute statements of reliability. Specific references, such as to research examples will typify a response in top band. An accurate but less developed response will constitute a second band response; a somewhat limited, superficial, more generic response that is nonetheless correct would find itself in the third band; and an answer that, while being flawed, contains some creditworthy material will receive a bottom band mark.

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
		<p>measure itself and can be tested using split-half method or item analysis. External reliability checks consistency from one use to another (over time, person to person) and can be tested using methods such as inter-rater reliability or test-retest. It may be expanded to consider such things as mood, control, interpretation, standard presentation, instruction and procedure, lying and social desirability but should be distinguished from validity with such examples. When looking at Holmes and Rahe's SRRS, the psychological and physiological measures employed by Johansson or the Hassles and Uplifts scale as well as other measures such as those used in the Kanner et al research, it is questionable whether (all things being equal) a similar result would be found on repetition of the test, due to concerns such as those listed above.</p>		
7	(a)	<p>How can dysfunctional behaviour be categorised?</p> <p>Refer to Appendix 1</p> <p>The specification suggests classification systems to categorise dysfunctional behaviour, such as the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual now in its fifth edition (DSM-V, 2013) or the International Classification of Diseases now in its tenth edition (ICD-10). Other ways of categorising dysfunctional behaviour would be acceptable responses, for example differing definitions could be used, but how they could provide different categories would need to be suggested rather than merely presenting a list of definitions. Both an outline of the classification system, or how it is used, are acceptable ways of addressing the question.</p>	10	<p>The better candidate will relate increasingly to how dysfunctional behaviour can be categorised, the weaker candidate merely reproduce a measure, for example. More specifically, weaker responses may be anecdotal, improving to a relevant description but struggling to use it to describe one way in which dysfunctional behaviour can be categorised. Better answers will relate increasingly to one way in which dysfunctional behaviour can be categorised.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
(b)	<p>To what extent is it appropriate to diagnose dysfunctional behaviour?</p> <p>Refer to Appendix 2</p> <p>The question involves a degree of judgement about the extent to which it is appropriate to diagnose dysfunctional behaviour. Appropriateness may be challenged on grounds of 'stickiness' of labels or the possibility of type1/type2 errors (Rosenhan). Validity may question whether a condition really exists, and if so is it in an agreed form and are the components we observe well defined and is there agreement about what constitutes that disorder. The medical model claims that a classification system defines the disorder, as the behaviourist approach claims the symptoms define the disorder, though we can debate the validity of the classifications, and the anti-psychiatry model of Szasz and Laing claim there is no appropriate label as mental disorders do not exist other than as social constructs of a particular time and place. The fact that clinicians cannot agree on diagnoses much more than half the time suggests that diagnoses are not particularly appropriate. Other considerations of appropriateness may also apply, most notably those concerning ethics.</p>	15	<p>Top band candidates will clearly consider the extent to which a list of characteristics is an appropriate way of identifying a given mental disorder. For example, they may observe that different constellations of characteristics lead to the same label, such as schizophrenic, so this may lead us to question the very label itself. The injunction also implies that a degree of judgement is required about 'how valid' a list of characteristics is in identifying the named disorder. Second band will be accurate and specific to the question but may, for example, have limited extension or poorly (or not) addressing the injunction; third band will be superficial, maybe accurate or appropriate material but not used to effectively address the question. The bottom band is for responses that may be flawed but have some creditworthy material included.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
8 (a)	<p>Using the biological approach, explain one chosen disorder (either affective or anxiety or psychotic)</p> <p>Refer to Appendix 1</p> <p>The chosen disorder should receive a genetic (eg evolutionary), biochemical (eg neurotransmitter) and/or neurological (brain structure) explanation or a combination of these. Candidates may use biological explanations as part of a broader explanation, such as referring to a biological pre-disposition for example. Typically, the better candidate will use the research to 'explain', the weaker candidate merely describing. The candidate may choose what aspect to explain, such as the cause or course, but some aspects will lend themselves better to explanation than others.</p>	10	<p>Top band candidates will provide an accurate and specific response to how a chosen disorder may be explained biologically, show extension in detail and/or understanding. Second band will be accurate and specific to title but with less detail, third band will be superficial but essentially correct; or accurate or appropriate material but not used to effectively or precisely address question. The bottom band is for responses that may be flawed but have some creditworthy material included.</p>
(b)	<p>To what extent are explanations of the disorder identified in part (a) reductionist?</p> <p>Refer to Appendix 2</p> <p>Reductionism, as opposed to holism, refers to a level of explanation offered. Scientific enquiry will traditionally reduce explanations to their component parts, such as atoms and molecules. By applying this to the human condition, do we gain insight into aspects or lose insight of the dynamics which are fundamental? Behaviourist explanations reduce behaviour to S-R units at its most reduced level whereas cognitive explanations take a more holistic line. The fact that these combine into the more contemporary cognitive-behaviourist approach makes for interesting debate. Similarly, biological explanations lend themselves to biological treatments, most commonly drug therapy, yet this is usually combined with psychological</p>	15	<p>Top band answers will consider reductionism in the context of the disorder identified in part (a). This commentary will show appreciation of what reductionism is beyond a bland statement, show some extension and go beyond mere evaluative statement. A judgement of degree of reductionism addressing the 'to what extent' demand will be given with words such as more, very or slightly for example. Second band answers will competently address the title with some but limited extension, maybe poorly (or not) addressing the injunction. Superficial, bland, general are adjectives which will typify a third band judgement; whereas a bottom band response will fail to meet this but contain some creditworthy material.</p>

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
		treatment maybe involving cognitive, CBT and/or psychodynamic counselling. Cognitive neuroscience and the Humanistic approach may contribute to the debate. The anti-psychiatry model may also find voice in an answer. The 'to what extent' injunction demands a degree of judgement and this will usually be part of a top band response.		
9	(a)	<p>Outline how personality may affect sports performance.</p> <p>Refer to Appendix 1</p> <p>There are a number of suggestions as to the impact of personality on sports performance, including sports participation. This may focus on personality differences between athletes and non-athletes, the elite athlete in contrast to the novice, personality requirements of one sporting activity in relation to another, or personality differences within a sport of one team position as opposed to another. Evidence could come from Kroll and Crenshaw (1970). Research that looks at the two camps in the credulous-sceptical debate is also acceptable in response to the 'may' part of the question.</p>	10	<p>The best candidates will provide a direct response to the context of the question, using psychological knowledge to address precisely how personality can be said to affect sports performance. Detail and/or quality of description in relation the sporting context will typify a top band response. Second band answers will accurately describe personality and sports performance but may lack the level of precision or detail required by the best answers. Some compromise in detail may indicate a second band response, whereas a more superficial response, maybe a straight reporting of a study with poorer reference to the specific question would be credited in the third band. Failing to achieve this but with some creditworthy material will achieve a bottom band mark. Typically, weaker responses may be anecdotal or consider personality without reference to sports performance.</p>
	(b)	<p>To what extent do individual and situational factors explain an athlete's sports performance?</p> <p>Refer to Appendix 2</p> <p>A paper by Kroll and Crenshaw indicates that disposition, namely different personality types favour the different sports of (American) football, gymnastics, wrestling and karate, and this principle could be generalised. Different personality types may be suited to different positions within team sports. Personality may also distinguish the elite</p>	15	<p>The best responses will go beyond identifying disposition and situation, and suggest whether there is a balance or where the emphasis is or which is most important, ie address the "to what extent...." command.</p> <p>Second band answers will be characterised by a compromise on the 'to what extent' command or more limited elaboration but still provide a good response.</p> <p>Third band responses will be somewhat more limited or superficial.</p> <p>Bottom band responses may be flawed but contain some</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>athlete from the novice or the athlete from the non-athlete. Are these distinctions valid? Do we know and agree what is meant by personality, and more specifically a sports personality? Or can performance be explained, or at least partially explained, by situational factors such as events the competitors' lives, the weather, the team's social dynamics, home advantage or even luck? A good response should discuss the extent to which these factors explain sports performance, including participation. Other aspects of personality, such as aggression or leadership may be considered relevant in response to the question.</p>		creditworthy material.
10 (a)	<p>Outline evidence that explains anxiety in sport from a multidimensional approach.</p> <p>Refer to Appendix 1</p> <p>Anxiety was originally conceived as a one-dimensional approaches, from Yerkes-Dodson through to Martens' early SCAT test; Spielberger (1970) proposed that two separate dimensions should be considered, being tested through his TAI and SAI (trait and state anxiety inventories), culminating in a recognition of the multidimensional approach to anxiety. Martens' CSAI-2 considered somatic anxiety, self-confidence and cognitive anxiety, splitting his previous notion of state anxiety into somatic state anxiety and cognitive state anxiety. Finally, Fazy and Hardy also use a multidimensional approach to explain the contingencies which lead to catastrophe. The question requires an explanation that anxiety in sport requires a combination of more than one dimension, usually cognitive and physiological, trait and state.</p>	10	<p>Detail, quality of description and interpretation of evidence in relation the sporting context will typify the better response. A direct response to the context of the question, using psychological knowledge to address the question, will be indicative of a top candidate. Some compromising in detail may indicate a second band response, whereas a more superficial response, maybe a straight reporting of a study with poorer reference to the specific question would be credited in the third band. Failing to achieve this but with some creditworthy material will achieve a bottom band mark.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
(b)	<p>Evaluate the use of quantitative and/or qualitative data when researching anxiety in sport.</p> <p>Refer to Appendix 2</p> <p>The specification refers largely to research involving quantitative data. The SCAT test and measures involving trait and state anxiety are common. Their regular use invites positive comments regarding reliability and (concurrent) validity, for example. Other references may also invite comment, such as Yerkes-Dodson identifying anxiety beyond the optimal point or Fazey and Hardy similarly using data to identify catastrophe rather than gradual decline. Examples of qualitative data often comes from accounts from top sportspeople. At the height of his career, the well known darts player Eric Bristow one day found that he was unable to release the dart from his fingers (White, 2001), an affliction which took him 10 years to overcome. Chell, Graydon and Holder (2001) examined examples of sudden and severe performance breakdown among 10 skilled athletes. Common themes emerging from the athletes' reports, all centring on sudden lack of fine motor control. These less precise accounts give greater depth, richness and insight, but lack the ease and precision of recording and drawing conclusions - these assertions could be challenged or substantiated.</p>	15	<p>The best responses will address the use of quantitative and/or qualitative data from research into anxiety in sport. Candidates will indicate research in this area, be explicit about the context of research which applies to sports anxiety and provide commentary. Second band answers will be characterised by a compromise on the 'Evaluate' command or more limited elaboration but still provide a good response. Third band responses will be somewhat more limited or superficial and bottom band responses may be flawed but contain some creditworthy material.</p>
11 (a)	<p>Describe research into aspects of cohesion in sport.</p> <p>Refer to Appendix 1</p> <p>The most likely researcher to be referred to is Albert Carron. He distinguished between task cohesion, where a group bonds to achieve a specific goal; and social</p>	10	<p>Stronger candidates will provide accounts with greater detail which appreciate the complexity required to provide a more accurate account of cohesion in sport. Second band responses will compromise detail; third band will be more superficial such as struggling with the detail, oversimplifying the model or contextualising their response. The weakest responses to receive a mark will be responses that are</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>cohesion, where a group bonds through sharing an activity. Carron suggests four factors which affect cohesion, namely environmental aspects, personal aspects, leadership aspects and team aspects. Each or any of these may be considered in response to the question, such as research into leadership styles</p>		<p>flawed but still contain some creditworthy material.</p>
(b)	<p>Discuss the ecological validity of research into group cohesion in sport.</p> <p>Refer to Appendix 2</p> <p>Ecological Validity is the degree to which the behaviours recorded in a study reflect the behaviours that actually occur in natural settings. Ecological validity is associated with generalisability which is the extent to which research can be generalised (extended) to the "real world".</p> <p>When Ringelmann looked at social loafing by observing a tug of war team, this was high in EV compared to Latane's clapping study which was lab based and was not as obviously transferable to a real-life sports setting.</p> <p>Tuckman's ideas could be said to have a degree of EV as they readily apply to the sports field, but this is limited as it comes from a different setting. Carron's work on group cohesion is in some ways very ecologically valid as there are direct references to sports, but a shift from theory to practice is required. Costill's swimming study is set in the field and so displays high EV. Such studies need to be linked to group cohesion.</p>	15	<p>'Discuss' requires a degree of judgement, maybe about how ecologically valid the research is rather than simply a statement of absolutes. An accurate and reasonably detailed, or cogent consideration with less detail will typify a good response. A generally accurate if rather limited consideration will indicate a mark in the third band. Weaker responses will fail to clearly identify explanations to be discussed, fail to relate to sport or fail to 'discuss....', but contain some creditworthy material.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
12 (a)	<p>Describe the relationship between exercise and mental health.</p> <p>Refer to Appendix 1</p> <p>There is an array of literature identifying the link between exercise and mental health, from Cognitive-Behavioural explanations through to more physiological explanations such as endorphin hypotheses. The responses to the question may broaden to include benefits in coping with illness and not necessarily be limited to the illness itself. Recent research in dance psychology shows the benefits of movement on mental health, including depression and Parkinson's disease.</p>	10	<p>The level of detail and application of research to answer the question will determine how creditworthy is the response. Top band responses will provide accounts with greater detail to provide a more accurate account of burnout and withdrawal in relation to exercise and sport. Responses in the second band will typically compromise detail but still be accurate responses to the question, third band responses will struggle with the detail or oversimplify or the response. The weakest responses to receive a mark will be responses that are flawed but still contain some creditworthy material.</p>
(b)	<p>Discuss ethical issues which could arise when conducting research into exercise and mental health.</p> <p>Refer to Appendix 2</p> <p>The 'discuss' command requires an evaluative response, but note that this can elicit both a positive and a negative response. The ethical consideration can be about the research topic itself or about the research process. The issues may be about the moral rights and wrongs, social sensitivity or methodological considerations such as confidentiality, fully informed consent, debriefing, invasion of privacy. Greater credit will be given to answers which go beyond the established assumptions, such as debating whether overstating the benefits of exercise may be followed by the patient not receiving sufficient medical intervention.</p>	15	<p>At the top level candidates will provide a more developed and/or elaborated response. Development/elaboration could be achieved, for example, by comparing evidence, challenging assumptions or extending a line of argument. A compromise in development/elaboration but a good response nonetheless will characterise a second band response; a somewhat limited or superficial response will typify a third band answer and a bottom band mark will be awarded for work which is flawed or anecdotal but contains some creditworthy aspects.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
13 (a)	<p>Describe variations on learning strategies.</p> <p>Refer to Appendix 1</p> <p>This question is quite open and there are many ways of responding to it. There are a huge number of different learning strategies which are employed throughout the education system. A good response would focus on the concept that students are believed to vary in their preferred learning styles, the way they process information, and how these interact with the demands of the educational setting. Students may need assistance in developing strategies which balance these factors and enable learning. Discussion of Curry's onion model (1983) is appropriate here, as would be McCarthy's 4mat system (1990) or Rezler and Rezmovic's Learning preferences system (1985) or any relevant model. The response should focus on strategies and not just styles.</p>	10	<p>Top band candidates will provide an accurate response specific to the question and show extension in detail and/or understanding. They will effectively describe variations on learning strategies.</p> <p>Second band will be reasonably accurate and specific to the question.</p> <p>Third band will be superficial, using accurate or appropriate material but not effectively linking it to the question. For example merely listing different learning styles without any mention link to strategies.</p> <p>The bottom band is for responses that may be flawed but have some creditworthy material included.</p>
(b)	<p>Compare personal approaches to learning</p> <p>Refer to Appendix 2</p> <p>Good answers will relate specific issues to one approach to learning, e.g. learning strategies and identify similarities or differences in other approaches e.g. cognitive styles and/or multiple intelligences. For example Multiple Intelligences (Gardner, 1993) are seen as fixed, as are VAK learning styles (Rose, 1985).</p>	15	<p>Top band candidates will provide an appropriate response to the question by drawing direct comparisons. These will be legitimate comparisons and show extension beyond a superficial statement, for example considering whether an approach is determinist and then clearly linking this through comparison or contrast to another theory.</p> <p>Second band will be accurate and specific to title but may, for example, struggle in its precision of comparison. Comparison may be evident but more superficial/less convincing than that required for top band.</p> <p>Third band will provide a more superficial response such as placing relevant explanations side-by-side and, aside from starting a paragraph with "In contrast..." fail to directly draw legitimate comparison.</p> <p>The bottom band is for responses that may be flawed but have some creditworthy material included.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
14 (a)	<p>What have educational psychologists learnt about self-esteem in relation to student participation?</p> <p>Refer to Appendix 1</p> <p>Likely answers will focus on Dweck (2006) who argues that is important to develop a growth mindset, where ability is seen as effort based, as opposed to a fixed mindset where ability is seen as innate. Those with growth mindset will be more persistent in the face of challenges and develop greater self-esteem. A fixed mindset will lead to a learner avoiding challenge, as failure will be seen as evidence of low ability and this would reduce self-esteem. Research by Pendlington (2004) on low self-esteem in low achievers is also relevant here.</p>	10	<p>Top band candidates will provide an accurate response specific to the question and show extension in detail and/or understanding. They will effectively explain links between self-esteem and student participation.</p> <p>Second band will be reasonably accurate and specific to the question.</p> <p>Third band will be superficial, using accurate or appropriate material e.g. just listing the different types.</p> <p>The bottom band is for responses that may be flawed but have some creditworthy material included.</p>
(b)	<p>Assess the usefulness of research into student beliefs and expectations</p> <p>Refer to Appendix 2</p> <p>Research refers to studies, theories or models. The term “useful” can be applied in several different ways – how useful the research could be in improving educational performance of students, can it have positive impact on the self-esteem of students etc. Also the candidate could challenge the usefulness of research on methodological issues such as ethnocentrism, gender bias, validity, reliability etc. If theories lack empirical support this could also limit usefulness. Relevant research includes Pendlington (2004), Dweck (2006), Gilligan (1982), Hartup (1989), Tatum & Herbert (1992), Wentzel & Caldwell (1997).</p>	15	<p>At the top band candidates will provide a well-developed and/or elaborated response which assesses the usefulness of research into student beliefs and expectations. Evidence to support points or issues will be apposite.</p> <p>Band 2 will cover a range of relevant issues supported by evidence but will lack balance or development.</p> <p>Band 3 will have some points which address the usefulness of research into student beliefs and expectations but is quite limited.</p> <p>Bottom band is very basic with little development or supporting evidence. For example ‘it is very useful.....’ or an ‘it is not useful.....’ type response with little more than anecdotal support.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
15 (a)	<p>How important is empathy and moral development to student-student social interactions?</p> <p>Refer to Appendix 1</p> <p>Both Eisenberg (1986) and Gilligan (1982) see empathy as a key feature of moral development. It is important for healthy student-student social interactions to be based upon care for others. More abstract notions of morality such as justice (as identified by Kohlberg) may be less likely to develop/ maintain positive student interactions. Good answers will engage with the question and provide support from research or theory. Weaker answers will be shallow and anecdotal.</p>	10	<p>Top band candidates will provide an accurate response specific to the question and show extension in detail and/or understanding. They will effectively explain the importance of empathy and moral development to student-student social interactions.</p> <p>Second band will be reasonably accurate and specific to the question.</p> <p>Third band will be superficial, using accurate or appropriate material e.g. just describing research/theory but with little relation to the question.</p> <p>The bottom band is for responses that may be flawed but have some creditworthy material included.</p>
(b)	<p>Evaluate the methodology of research into student-student social interactions.</p> <p>Refer to Appendix 2</p> <p>This question is an open evaluation so can refer to strengths as well as limitations. Candidates can use a wide range of issues to answer the question, as long as they relate specifically to the methods employed by researchers in this topic; Suitable issues may include: issues related to experimental design, validity, reliability, ethics, generalisation from the sample, qualitative/quantitative data etc. Relevant research includes Smith & Shu (2000), Wentzel & Caldwell (1997), Nodding (2005, 2006)</p>	15	<p>At the top band candidates will provide a well-developed and/or elaborated response containing precise evaluative points and/or issues which impact on the methodology of the research. A balanced argument would contain both positive and negative points which show a deeper understanding of a range of methodological issues. Evidence to support points or issues will be apposite.</p> <p>Band 2 will cover a range of relevant issues supported by evidence but will lack balance or development.</p> <p>Band 3 will identify some issues which relate to the methodology of research but is quite limited.</p> <p>Bottom band is very basic – ‘it is valid because.....’ or an ‘it isn’t very ethical...’ type response with little development or supporting evidence.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
16 (a)	<p>Describe the use of remedial support for students with additional needs.</p> <p>Refer to Appendix 1</p> <p>Students are likely to describe to Marie Clay's Reading Recovery (1985) which involves 1:1 tutoring or small group sessions with multi-sensory support to develop children's problem solving ability when reading. Differentiation or other strategies are also creditworthy here. Good answers will clearly explain how remedial support is used, weaker answers may only describe research and not engage with the question.</p>	10	<p>Top band candidates will provide an accurate response specific to the question and show extension in detail and/or understanding. They will effectively explain the use of remedial support with students.</p> <p>Second band will be reasonably accurate and specific to the question.</p> <p>Third band will be superficial, using accurate or appropriate material for example describing research without describing the use of the technique/strategy.</p> <p>The bottom band is for responses that may be flawed but have some creditworthy material included.</p>
(b)	<p>Discuss the validity of research into the additional needs of students.</p> <p>Refer to Appendix 2</p> <p>Candidates should discuss the validity of research into the additional needs of students. Validity considers to what extent the research investigates what it claims to be investigating. "Discuss" requires the candidate to appreciate different views regarding the validity of research.</p> <p>Validity takes many forms and can refer to the internal validity of the research measures being used, such as self-reports etc.</p> <p>Considerations of external validity are appropriate here. Ecological validity is a suitable issue; much of the appropriate research is based in real world settings. The use of longitudinal research such as Burroughs-Lange (2008) is high in validity as it demonstrates long term effects of Reading Recovery. Relevant research includes Bloom (1984), Lewis & Norwich (2001)</p>	15	<p>At the top band candidates will provide a well-developed and/or elaborated response containing precise evaluative points and/or issues which impact on the validity of the research. A balanced argument would contain both positive and negative points which show a deeper understanding of validity. Evidence to support points or issues will be apposite. Top band answers should refer to more than one type of validity.</p> <p>Band 2 will cover a range of relevant issues supported by evidence but will lack balance or development.</p> <p>Band 3 will have some issues which address the validity of research but is quite limited.</p> <p>Bottom band is very basic – 'it is valid because.....' or an 'it isn't very valid...' type response with little development or supporting evidence.</p>

APPENDIX 1 – GENERIC MARK SCHEME FOR PART (A) QUESTIONS

Marks	Generic Mark scheme (part a)
0 Marks	No or irrelevant answer.
1-2 Marks	Psychological terminology is sparse or absent . Description of evidence is limited, mainly inaccurate and lacks detail. There is no interpretation or explanation of the evidence in the context of the question. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors.
3-5 Marks	Psychological terminology is basic but adequate . Description of evidence is generally accurate and coherent, has peripheral relevance but lacks detail. Elaboration/use of example/ quality of description is reasonable but interpretation of the evidence in the context of the question is poor. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors
6-8 Marks	Psychological terminology is competent and mainly accurate . Description of evidence is mainly accurate and relevant, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is good. There is some evidence of interpretation and explanation in the context of the question. The answer has good structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors
9-10 Marks	Correct and comprehensive use of psychological terminology. Description of evidence is accurate, relevant, coherent and detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is very good and the ability to interpret/explain the evidence selected in the context of the question is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.

APPENDIX 2 – GENERIC MARK SCHEME FOR PART (B) QUESTIONS

Marks	Generic Mark Scheme (part b)
0 Marks	No or irrelevant answer.
1-3 Marks	Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse . No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.
4-7 Marks	Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments are evident and demonstrate some understanding.
8-11 Marks	Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments are competent and understanding is good .
12-15 Marks	Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments are highly skilled and show thorough understanding.

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2016

